TITLE II PROJECT APPLICATION ROSEBURG DISTRICT RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

1. Project Number (Assigned by federal unit): ___

3. County: Douglas

4. Project Sponsor: Larry Brooks, A	lan James	5. Date: 6/21/2001
6. Sponsor's Phone Number: (541)	464-3262, 464-3260	
7. Sponsors E-mail: lbrooks@or.blr	m.gov, aljames@or.blm.gov	
	_	
8. Project Location (attach project area n	nap)	
a. 4 th Field Watershed Name and HU	C #(if known): Umpqua 17100	303
b. 5 th Field Watershed Name and HU	C #(if known): Upper Umpqua	1710030302.
c. Legal Location: Township 26S	Range <u>07W</u> Section(s) <u>5</u> ,	6, 7, 8, & 9 (See map for more
details)	-	· -
Description: The unit boundaries (s	ee map for more details) are pr	eliminary project areas that gives
the ID Team an area to begin to eval	uate and are subject to change of	luring the Environmental
Assessment process.		_
d. BLM District Roseburg	e. BLM Resource Area Swift	water Field Office
f. National Forest	g. Forest Service District	
h. State / Private / Other lands involv	ved? □ Yes 🛮 No	

9. Statement of Project Goals and Objectives:

2. Project Name: Green Butte Density Management

The project is located within the Late-Successional Reserve (LSR) land allocation as described in the April 13, 1994, Record of Decision (ROD). LSRs are to be managed to maintain and enhance conditions of late-successional and old-growth forest ecosystems. The purpose of the Density Management - Commercial Thinning is to maintain or improve tree growth rates and vigor, manipulate species composition and spatial arrangement. The post treatment stand will have or more quickly develop old-growth forest characteristics including snags, large trees for recruitment of coarse woody debris (CWD), large limbed trees, and canopy gaps that enable establishment of multiple tree layers and diverse species composition, including hardwoods. Without treatment the hardwood component will die out due to suppression, opportunities for multiple tree layers and species diversity will diminish, and the proposed areas will develop into a less complex stand. This is inconsistent with late-successional objectives. Creating variation in density and distribution of overstory and understory vegetation will result in conditions more similar to late-successional forests. Benefits to the area are wildlife habitat will be enhanced from increased stand structural diversity, while generating work for the local community and producing a commodity. The area proposed for treatment resulted from a wildfire and and subsequent salvage operations in the 1950's. Existing stands are a result of natural regeneration or planting and are now overstocked.

TITLE II PROJECT APPLICATION ROSEBURG DISTRICT RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Density Management is located within the South Coast - Northern Klamath LSR (LSR 261). LSR 261 is ranked as high priority for management actions because it is one of the large key links in the LSR network. Treatment within this LSR provides the opportunity to either increase or develop large contiguous stands of interior late-successional habitat.

10. Project Description: (Provide concise description of project and attach map.)				
The proposed Green Butte Density Management is in T 27	7 S - R 7 W - Sections 5, 6, 7, 8, & 9.			
The density management would consist of merchantable a be designed to accelerate the development of late successit treatment is an intermediate treatment to increase tree size various stand components beneficial to late-successional r increase diversity by including areas of variable spacing, u or small openings. Desirable hardwood species would be around them.	onal characteristics. This silvicultural and crown development and to provide elated species. The treatment would anthinned patches, heavily thinned patches			
11. Coordination of this project with other related project	ject(s) on adjacent lands?			
☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, then describe				
12. How does proposed project meet purposes of the L	0			
☐ Improves maintenance of existing infrastructure. [Sec. 2(b)]				
☑ Implements stewardship objectives that enhance forest	ecosystems. [Sec. 2(b)]			
☑ Restores and improves land health. [Sec. 2(b)]				
☐ Restores water quality. [Sec. 2(b)]				
13. Project Type (check one) [Sec. 203(b)(1)]				
☐ Road Maintenance [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]	☐ Trail Maintenance [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]			
☐ Road Decommission/Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]	☐ Trail Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]			
☐ Other Infrastructure Maintenance (specify): [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A				
☐ Soil Productivity Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(B)]				
□ Watershed Restoration & Mntc. [Sec. 2(b)(2)(D)]	☑ Wildlife Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]			
☐ Fish Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]	☐ Control of Noxious Weeds [Sec. 2(b)(2)(F)]			
☐ Reestablish Native Species [Sec. 2(b)(2)(G)]				
☐ Other Project Type (specify) [Sec. 2(b)(2)]:				

TITLE II PROJECT APPLICATION ROSEBURG DISTRICT RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

14. Measure of Project Accomplishments/Expected Outcomes [Sec. 203(b)(5)]					
a. Total Acres: Approximately 420 b. Total Miles:					
c. No. Structures:	d. Est. People Reached (for environmental education projects):				
e. No. Laborer Days:					
f. Other (specify):					

15. Duration of Project and Estimated Completion Date: [Sec. 203(b)(2)]

NEPA, field work, and project design to be done FY2002, sale date the last quarter of FY2003, project implementation in FY2004 and FY2005

16. Target Species Benefitted: (if applicable)

Douglas-fir, Grand fir, Hemlock, various hardwoods, and old growth dependent wildlife such as the spotted owl.

17. How will cooperative relationships among people that use federal lands be improved? [Sec. 2(b)(3)]

The public will be involved, comment, and make meaningful input on a cutting edge project that demonstrates how forest habitat can be improved and also produce commodities.

18. How is this project in the best public interest? [Sec. 203(b)(7)] Identify benefits to communities. A more fully functioning Late Successional Reserves that has also provided forest jobs for woods workers and commodities for mill workers to process.

19. How does project benefit federal lands/resources?

Density management is a silvicultural activity that can enhance, create, or quicken development of old growth characteristics.

20. Status of Project Planning				
a. NEPA Complete:	□ Yes ⊠ No			
If no, give est. date of completion:	October 2002			
c. NMFS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:	□ Yes ⋈ No			
d. USFWS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:	□ Yes ⊠ No			
e. Survey & Manage Complete:	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Not Applicable			
f. DSL/ODFW* Permits for In-stream Work Obtained:	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Not Applicable			
g. DSL/COE* 404 Fill/Removal Permit Obtained:	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Not Applicable			
h. SHPO* Concurrence Received:	☐ Yes ☒ No Not Applicable			
i. Project Design(s) Completed:	□ Yes ⊠ No			
* DSL = Dept. of State Lands, ODFW = Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, COE = Army Corps of Engineers, SHPO =				
State Historic Preservation Officer				

TITLE II PROJECT APPLICATION ROSEBURG DISTRICT RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

21. Proposed Method(s) of Accomplishment	
⊠ Contract ⊠	Federal Workforce
☐ County Workforce ☐	Volunteers
☐ Other (specify):	
22. Will the Project Generate Merchantable ⊠ Yes □ No	Materials? [Sec. 204(e)(3)]
23. Anticipated Project Costs [Sec. 203(b)(3)]	
a. Total County Title II Funds Requested: \$4	30,000
b. Is this a multi-year funding request? X□ Ye	s □ No If yes, then display by fiscal year
c. FY02 Request: \$250,000 f. FY05 Requ	nest: \$35,000
d. FY03 Request: \$130,000 g. FY06 Reque	est:

Table 1. Project Cost Analysis

e. FY04 Request: 15,000

Item	Column A Fed. Agency Appropriated Contribution [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Column B Requested County Title II Contribution [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Column C Other Contributions [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Column D Total Available Funds
24. Field Work & Site Surveys		\$240,000		
25. NEPA & Sec. 7 ESA Consultation		\$ 45,000		
26. Permit Acquisition				
27. Project Design & Engineering		\$ 55,000		
28. Contract Preparation		\$ 7,000		
29. Contract Administration		\$ 35,000		
30. Contract Cost		\$ 3,000		
31. Workforce Cost				
32. Materials & Supplies		\$ 5,000		
33. Monitoring		\$ 40,000		
34. Other	\$ 10,000			
35. Project Sub-Total	\$ 10,000	\$430,000		
36. Indirect Costs (Overhead) (per year for multi-year projects)	\$5,000/year (4 years)			
37. Total Cost Estimat	s 30.000	\$430,000		

TITLE II PROJECT APPLICATION ROSEBURG DISTRICT RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

- 38. Identify Source(s) of Other Funding for Project Identified Above [Sec. 203(b)(4)]
- **39. Monitoring Plan** [Sec. 203(b)(6)]
 - a. What measures or evaluations will be made to determine how well the proposed project meets the desired ecological conditions? [Sec. 203(b)(6)] Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?
 - Areas will be checked as the stand is painted for treatment to ensure marking is consistent with the prescription.
 - Foresters will cruise the stand.
 - Contract administrators will inspect the sale area for contract compliance.
 - Stand will be recommended in BLM Micro*Storms data base tracking system for evaluation in ten to fifteen years for subsequent treatments.
 - Post treatment plots will be performed to measure the stands postreat condition
 - b. How will the project be evaluated to determine how well the proposed project contributes towards local employment and/or training opportunities, including summer youth jobs programs such as the Youth Conservation Corps? [Sec. 203(b)(6)] Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?

The Contracting Officer will estimate workforce quantity and duration

c. What methods and measures of evaluation will be established to determine how well the proposed project improves the use of, or added value to, any products removed from federal lands consistent with the purposes of this Act? [Sec. 203(b)(6) and Sec. 204(e)(3)] Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?

There are existing rules that do not allow for exportation of logs without primary processing (except for Port Orford Cedar). This will ensure that commodities produced are processed within the United States.

d. Identify total funding needed to carry out specified monitoring tasks (Table 1, item 33):

\$40,000

